

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion

AUG 12 1953

VOL. XIII, No. 14

AUGUST 3, 1953

2.50 per year, 10 cents per copy

Can the Churches Halt "McCarthyism"?

EVENTS of the past fortnight have brought some easement to the deepening apprehension of informed citizens over the uninhibited and unobstructed advance of "McCarthyism". By that term is designated the whole complex of practices by officials and agencies of government-inquisitorial investigations, "book-burning," intimidation of able and loyal government servants, increasing dominance of Senator McCarthy, Representative Velde and their ilk over government departments and activities—which constitute an alarming threat to national health and honor.

Senator McCarthy's capitulation to the upsurge of indignation over the J. B. Matthews appointment, followed by President Eisenhower's prompt and emphatic endorsement of protests by spokesmen from the three major American faiths, is the first significant setback to "McCarthyism" since the retreat of Congressman Velde, yielding to similar pressures, from his intention to investigate the clergy some months ago.

The fact that both of these arrests to the orgy of investigations were in defense of the clergy argues the timeliness of a reexamination and redefinition of the role and responsibility of the churches with respect to this grave menace to national well-being. Three points deserve underscoring.

I

It is important to take the full measure of the struggle, and the character and determination of those who wage it.

No one who understands the aims and methods of Senator McCarthy and his associates will suppose that his defeat in the Matthews incident is more than a temporary and tactical withdrawal. In *Time's* graphic figure of the prize-fight, "None of this meant that Joe McCarthy was on the skids, or even groggy. . . . Though bloodied, . . . Joe was still swinging as the bell ended his worst round." Indeed, though Senator McCarthy is the most spec-

tacular and perhaps the most sinister symbol of the evil, it is possible to exaggerate his personal importance, and to be lulled into the delusion that his curtailment would eliminate the problem.

The American people have not yet begun to estimate the extent of the inroads upon the structure of justice and truth and freedom suffered in the past six months, or how little of the ground lost has thus far been reclaimed. They need to realize that one of McCarthy's henchmen still occupies a key post in the State Department, and wields a constant threat over its professional personnel. They need to know that telephone wires of high-ranking State Department officials are regularly tapped, that statesmen who have held foremost posts in the nation's service do not risk talking to Foreign Service officers in their private offices; so far have methods associated with the Kremlin penetrated the agency of the American Government charged with combatting those methods abroad. They need to face the fact that the absurd furor over "book-burning" has not only made their country a laughing-stock in the eyes of peoples throughout the world whom we hope to win or hold for the cause of "freedom"; it has gone far to undo the gains achieved by the admirable Information Service Libraries, probably the most effective instrument of American propaganda all over the world.

II

It is important to define more precisely what are the real issues in the present struggle.

It is usually described in terms of the "vindication of freedom." What is at stake is not merely the protection of the "fundamental freedoms" of speech, of thought, of teaching and of public activity—great and precious as these values are. "Freedom" has become a weasel-word of contemporary parlance, all too often employed to justify irresponsibility and even license. What is at stake is the preservation of values at once far more elemental and far more essential to a sound society—*truth* and *justice*—upon

which any system of personal freedoms must be grounded.

The greatest evil in the practices of which Senator McCarthy is a principal agent is not their constriction upon unfettered and sometimes untractable liberty, but their perversion of truth and their prostitution of justice. It was not limitation of the freedom of the clergy through imposition of illegitimate restraints, but impugnation of the loyalty of the clergy through gross misrepresentations of fact, which stirred outraged protest against J. B. Matthews. It is not the inconvenience of appearance before congressional hearings but the debauching of justice in their conduct and findings which constitute the threat in current investigations and allied practices.

It is time that the battle was shifted from the mere defense of "freedom" to the far more fundamental issues of the vindication of truth and justice.

III

Finally, it is important to broaden the struggle from the protection of particular groups within the community to the safeguarding of the entire citizenry.

Thus far agitation against "investigation which has become inquisition" has been almost wholly in behalf of educators or clergy. It is, regrettably, characteristic of both of these professions to be excessively preoccupied with their own interests and welfare, jealous for their own rights and liberties.

The issues at stake are not in the relations of particular bodies of citizens, whether teachers or preachers, and government. They are issues which concern all men as citizens. As a recent editorial in the *National Council Outlook* well said, "The first thing to bear in mind is that the clergyman is a citizen. . . . He should be no more exempt from the consequences of his act than any other citizen." The current threat is not to any one group or profession. What is imperilled is the nation as a whole and all its members.

It is high time that the churches and their clergy came clearly and boldly forth from the special protections which they are always tempted to erect about themselves and their prerogatives, often buttressed by a specious interpretation of the "separation of church and state," and took their stand simply as American institutions and American citizens, seeking no protection which is not equally available to any other organization or person, and demanding no right and no privilege which is not equally guaranteed to everyone else.

The churches are not called upon to battle for their special interests, nor to seek support from

others, even the President of the United States, for their defense. The churches *are* called upon to make the commonweal their cause, and to lead the struggle in behalf of truth and justice as well as legitimate freedom for all men.

Twice in recent months, it has been shown that the churches and their clergy are the one element within the nation which cannot be attacked with impunity (clear proof, incidentally, that the churches are a more consequential force in national life than their detractors had supposed). This fact lays upon the churches the duty, not simply to continue vigilant in defense of their own rights, but to assume their larger and rightful role in the nation as guardian of its conscience and defender of truth and justice.

The call comes to the churches to set forth the facts with unimpeachable accuracy and determined reiteration, to define and declare the real issues with unmistakable clarity, and to rally the confused and demoralized American populace to the vindication and safeguarding of the essentials of their national health and welfare. It appears doubtful whether any other corporate force can, or will undertake that responsibility.

H. P. V. D.

Correspondence

Sir:

From the tone of Mr. Charles Drake's article in the July 6th issue of *Christianity and Crisis* one might get the impression that the South is waging a major battle against the so-called "new Bible" (R. S. V.).

But I find little evidence to support that impression. To be sure, Luther Hux staged a wayside bonfire in North Carolina (though not at High Point, as the author states), but it was attended by a mere handful; and its perpetrator, a troublemaker in his own Baptist denomination, is almost forgotten. Shortly after this affair, some fifty communities in the state, aggregating several thousand, publicly testified to their joy in the coming of the new version of the Bible.

If the South were really waging "the battle" that Mr. Drake referred to, such influential bodies as the Southern Baptists, the Southern Presbyterians, and the Methodists would not have placed their official blessing upon the R. S. V. For example, the Presbyterians (U. S.) recently voted in their Assembly to print the R. S. V. text in all their church school literature.

Yes, there are valleys of darkness in these parts, as elsewhere, but there are also peaks of light. The so-called "battle" is, in my opinion, a mere skirmish.

Cordially yours,

H. Shelton Smith,
Duke University,
North Carolina.

The Protestant Clergy and Communism

JOHN C. BENNETT

THE Churches should respond to the charge that there are many Communist sympathizers among the clergy by insisting on fairness and a sense of proportion in the presentation of the evidence. Also the evidence needs to be seen in the appropriate historical context. There are two facts which need to be emphasized. The first is that for over two decades there has been a group of Protestant ministers who have identified themselves with the Communist cause and who have used their position as ministers of the Church to serve that cause. The second fact is that this group of Communists or "fellow travelers" among the clergy has never been as isolated as it is today. Its influence has reached the vanishing point.

When people refer to any statement or organization which is evidence for the influence of Communism among the clergy or any other group in America, they should first date that statement or organization. Mr. Arthur Hays Sulzberger, the publisher of the *New York Times*, has proposed that there be an amnesty—legal, moral, psychological—for all who have been identified with organizations influenced by Communism before 1948. I cannot imagine anything that would clear the air more than the general acceptance of such an amnesty. It would be based upon the recognition that the moral meaning of a person's relationship to various organizations sponsored by Communists varies enormously with the period in which it has been in effect. Few of the investigators who are looking for Communists today seem to have any understanding of this fact. There have been two periods before 1948 when it was quite natural for socially progressive Christians to show a sympathetic interest in Communism.

This was especially true of the period before the great Russian purges in the 1930s. In those days Americans visited Russia in large numbers and they usually came back with a mixed but hopeful view of the Russian experiment. There was some reason to believe at that time that the Russian revolution would outgrow its atrocities. Russia was still an under-dog in the world and it was no serious menace to this country. There was no cold war. One could give Russia the benefit of the doubt without in any way becoming less loyal to America. The real enemy for many years was Fascism, and Communism seemed to be an ally against that form of totalitarianism which alone had the power to enslave other nations. Marxist thinking about society was very persuasive during the years of the depression as it is not today. American intellectuals were often much

attracted by Marxism as a body of thought and as a plan for history.

Many Christians felt this attraction and were able to explain away, to their own satisfaction, the Marxist rejection of religion. One of the most widely read books in the early thirties among progressive ministers was a book by Professor John Macmurray, *Creative Society*, which explained that behind the professed atheism of Marxism there was a genuine faith in a superhuman providence compared with which the conventional faith of the Churches was called "pseudo-religion." I remember that I was much impressed by the book at the time, though I never had any interest in Communism as an American political movement. It was not difficult in those days to take a favorable view of the general Marxist diagnosis of society and of the Russian experiment—at least for the Russians. I have been in several Asian countries in recent years in which the same pattern is being repeated among intellectuals, even to some extent among Christian intellectuals.

I

This period came to an end soon after the purges in 1936 and 1937 and the final blow to most of those who retained some illusions about Communism came with the pact between Stalin and Hitler in 1939. That marked the end for a time of the united fronts and of the appeal of Stalinism in America. But the period of the war-time alliance between Russia and the western democracies gave another opportunity to Americans who were disposed to believe the best about Russia and Communism. Soon after the war, the disillusionment set in again. Mr. Sulzberger is right in selecting 1948 as the date after which a person's connection with Communist supported movements calls for special explanation.

There is one factor which goes far to explain the willingness of many ministers since 1948 to relate themselves to committees in which the Communists have or have had an interest and that is the very widespread tendency towards pacifism among them. I have before me, as I write, a letter-head of a peace organization established after 1948. I do not know all the names on the list but I know enough of them to make some general comments. There are six or seven names which would make me suspect that the organization may be one that is being used by the Communists. There are thirteen names of people who, I am quite sure, have no Communist sympathies, who would never want to be used by Communists but who because of their general orientation on problems of peace and foreign policy

find themselves in agreement with the expressed objectives of the organization. This letter-head is typical of many. They were common both in the period between the Hitler-Stalin pact and the invasion of Russia and they have been common since 1948.

I do not pretend to understand the small group of consistent Communist sympathizers who have defended the policies of the Soviet Union from 1930 to this hour. Whether or not they have been party members makes little difference. There have been very few of them but at various times they have had positions of considerable influence in at least three denominations. Today that influence has largely gone and nothing is gained by investigations which emphasize what they did five, ten, or fifteen years ago, as though it had relevance to the present situation in the Churches.

Mr. Philbrick may be right in claiming that some of these Communist sympathizers were planted in the Churches by the Communist Party. I have been in a position to watch the development of several of the more influential "fellow travellers" closely and it would be difficult for me to believe that they were not sincere Christian social idealists who gradually became convinced that the Communist movement was the best means of giving expression to that idealism. They took this position when historical circumstances made it easier to hold a hopeful view of Communism than it is today and they have never been able to open their minds fully to new facts. I do not deny that there may also be a few who began as cynical Communist agents in the Church and who have merely used religion for their political purposes but they are not the persons of whom I have been speaking and who have had considerable influence in the Churches.

II

J. B. Matthews in the much publicized article on "Reds and Our Churches" in *The American Mercury* makes the flat statement that in the past seventeen years "the Communist party has enlisted the support of at least seven thousand Protestant clergymen." He says that these fall into several categories: "party members, fellow-travellers, espionage agents, party line adherents, and unwitting dupes." In the article he does not indicate how he would substantiate any such figure. In a newspaper interview he says that he has a file of "about a quarter-million cards listing affiliations with Communist and Communist front organizations." He admits that there is a great deal of overlapping in membership among these organizations. He implies that he can find the name of seven thousand clergymen in this file. If the file is no more accurate than the published files on Bishop Oxnam and Mrs. Douglas Horton it does not mean much.

All lists of signers of statements or of sponsors of organizations which have had at one time a Communist connection are false if they are used to suggest that most of the persons on the lists have or have had Communist sympathies. Many widely publicized lists include organizations which have been consistently opposed to Communism but which are to the left of the people who compile the lists. Often these compilers assume that Communism is "Socialism in a hurry" and so they include Socialist organizations and then they assume that all the changes of the "New Deal" type are examples of "creeping Socialism." On this basis they are able to catch in their nets almost anyone who supports policies which they oppose. Then their lists are copied by other compilers. Mr. Matthews' lists may not be as wild as this but it is by such methods that *The Red-Network*, the source of innumerable other lists, was compiled. Even if we take seriously only those lists whose compilers know the difference between Socialism and Communism and who have taken reasonable care to limit themselves to organizations which have at one time been real Communist fronts, we must still take into account the following three considerations:

The first is that many organizations began as fully honest organizations without any Communist connection. Gradually Communists and fellow-travellers did get control of them but many of their members who are now on these lists fought hard against the Communists. Later they resigned but the fact that they once belonged to the organizations seems to have an indelible character and it is still held against them by those who use these lists.

Secondly, the various front organizations were often well disguised. One would have had to be an expert on Communist tactics to detect any Communist connection at all. The Communists were very clever and kept people who could be easily identified as Communists out of sight. The announced purposes of the organizations convincingly represented anti-Fascism, civil liberties or some particular humanitarian cause.

A third consideration is that many ministers who knew about the presence of Communists in an organization felt so deeply about the cause that it represented that they were unwilling to draw back because of these Communists. They sincerely believed that the cause was so important that it ought not to be abandoned to the Communists and that they and other non-Communists could put their stamp on the organizations.

Mr. Matthews has put portions of his file into his article. My contention is that though most of his data may be accurate in detail it seldom means what he suggests and it is often put into a misleading historical context.

He gives some lists of names taken from a report

of the Congressional Committee on Un-American Activities dated April 1951. This list of names is supposed to provide "overwhelming evidence of the inroads of Communism into the Protestant churches." They are taken from a list of 471 names of ministers who have given some support to the Communist inspired peace movements. As I study Mr. Matthews' lists I see the names of well known Christian pacifists who signed the various statements for pacifist and not for Communist reasons. Among these are liberal churchmen who have signed statements of this sort for many years without taking seriously the question of sponsorship. I have in mind some of the most honored leaders of the Church who have made it a practice to concern themselves only with the content of a statement or the professed aims of an organization and have never worried about sponsorship or associations. I believe that these men have been mistaken in doing this but the fact that they do it does not prove much about Communist influence on the Churches. Mr. Matthews refers to "A World Peace Appeal" signed by 253 Protestant clergymen in 1950. He does not give many names and those which he does give are not widely influential. I suspect that there are among them a good many younger men who have never yet had their fingers burned by signing Communist statements for non-Communist reasons.

I can sympathize with such people when a letter comes to my desk asking me to sign a manifesto against the McCarran Act sponsored by a committee which Mr. Matthews mentions. I see a few names on the letter-head which make me suspicious but I fully agree with the statement and most of the names inspire confidence. I do not know whether this committee is a Communist front or not but I have learned to be cautious and so I do not sign. Is this wise caution or is this cowardice? Is this chiefly an indication that I am in my own way a victim of McCarthyism? I do not criticize others who sign but there is a chance that in some future article their names will appear as evidence of Communist influence in the Church.

III

The worst feature of Mr. Matthews' article is not these recent lists of names which prove so little. They are at least given dates. But he goes on to discuss several organizations without dating their activities. Three of these organizations have had considerable support in the Churches in other periods but today they are either non-existent or they have lost most of their support. Most of their supporters never believed that they were Communist fronts. But to use them today as evidence of Communist inroads into the Protestant Churches is not honest. These three organizations are as follows: The People's Institute of Applied Religion associated with

the name of Claude C. Williams; *The Protestant*; The Methodist Federation for Social Action.

Claude Williams and his Institute gained much support for years because he seemed to be one person who went all-out in his identification with and service to the share croppers and the poorest groups that had migrated to Northern cities from the South. Churchmen who knew nothing about Mr. Williams' politics supported his work in Detroit because he seemed to have a Christian message which at least had social relevance for the least privileged adherents of the "sects" whom the Churches had been unable to reach. I can remember years of debate as to whether Mr. Williams and his organization were controlled by Communist purposes or not. During these years he was staunchly defended by non-Communists who had become personally loyal to him in his early struggles. Socially sensitive ministers who are themselves serving comfortable congregations have for years given the benefit of the doubt, in spite of suspicions, to men who were not *known* to be Communists and seemed to be doing a constructive job which they themselves could not do. This loyalty to individuals about whom it was difficult to believe evil for quite personal reasons accounts for the continued support of Communist movements by non-Communists long after, on purely objective grounds, they should have renounced them. Today this organization has disappeared from sight.

The Protestant has had a fantastic history. It gathered in the early days the support of the greatest assortment of Church leaders. Many of them supported it because of their interest in Protestantism and their fear of Roman Catholics. I remember when I was asked to be a sponsor about 1940. I refused, not because I suspected that it was Communist controlled, but because I disliked the strident character of its criticisms of Catholicism. I have watched people become disillusioned about the journal one by one during a whole decade. Now it has lost almost all of its early supporters and it has difficulty in continuing at all even on a very reduced scale. To cite it as evidence of Communist influence in the Churches today is absurd.

The Methodist Federation for Social Action has had a tragic history. I am sorry to have to write about it in this connection because its origin and early history were so fine. For many years I regarded it as the best unofficial agency for Christian Social Action. Its executive leadership did come to be very uncritical of the Soviet Union and Communist policies. In spite of this it was able for years to hold the loyalty of hundreds of the finest leaders of the Methodist Church. Its Board of Directors continued to represent that leadership long after its executives had proved that they were following uncritically the Communist line on most issues. Personal loyalties and the refusal to yield

under fire explain much of this continued support by people who have no sympathy for Communism. The unfair tactics of those who have represented aggressive "anti-Communism" in this country explains the unwillingness of many non-Communists to admit that any of the criticisms of socially progressive organizations are valid. When the Methodist Federation had influence in the Church, it was in spite of its pro-Communist orientation. It has largely lost its influence. To use it as an example of the present influence of Communism in the Churches is misleading, to say the least.

It is ironical that the publicity about Communist influence in the Churches is greatest at a time when that influence is weaker than it has been at any time in twenty years. There is one reason for the desire of many extreme social conservatives to keep this issue alive at the present time. In his concluding paragraph Mr. Matthews reveals it. He refers to Walter Rauschenbusch and Harry F. Ward as the

pioneers of the Social Gospel. Since he has had much to say about Dr. Ward's activities in behalf of Communism it seems that he is here attempting to apply the "guilt by association" technique to Rauschenbusch even though Rauschenbusch died the year after the Russian Revolution! Mr. Matthews goes on, against this background, to attack the Social Gospel in general. He is doing exactly what John T. Flynn has done. The Social Gospel, however some of its earlier theological presuppositions need to be modified, represented the turning away of a large part of Protestant leadership from the kind of religious individualism which had made Christianity irrelevant to the problems of justice. Today there are many extreme social conservatives whose chief aim is to restore that religious individualism. They are now using the Communist smear to discredit the heritage of the Social Gospel as a whole and with it the contemporary social teachings of the Churches.

The World Church: News and Notes

Mackay vs. Matthews

The *New York Times* of July 3 printed a report that three members of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations had protested the publication of an article entitled, "Reds and Our Churches," written in the July number of *The American Mercury* by the new Executive Director of the Sub-Committee, Mr. J. B. Matthews. The *Times* of July 8 reported that, at the insistence of the Chairman of the Committee, the services of Mr. Matthews were to be retained. Today, July 10, we learn that his resignation has been accepted.

I happen to be one of the clergymen mentioned in the article which has caused the present controversy. I am also one of the educators whom Mr. Matthews, in the May number of the same magazine, indicated as "top collaborationists" with Communism!

When a congressional committee through its chairman employs as its Executive Director a man who has brought an irresponsible and indiscriminate charge against thousands of American educators and thousands of Protestant clergymen, the very semblance of impartiality, the last trace of objectivity, disappears from the high investigative tribunal. The accuser becomes the investigator. The seriousness of the situation is not altered by the resignation of Mr. Matthews. The fact that the appointment could have been made at all and then arbitrarily, though temporarily, insisted upon, exposes the inner logic of a current trend. We confront the Twentieth Century American version of the Sixteenth Century Spanish Inquisition. The new Inquisition already has its "Grand Inquisitor," who, like his famous prototype, thinks in patterns which have been made familiar to the world by totalitarian regimes. The "Grand Inquisitor" seeks a henchman of a type similar to himself.

The old-time Inquisition in Spain undertook to deter-

mine what characteristics a man should have to be truly Spanish, or thoroughly un-Spanish. In doing so it becomes the chief source of that process which, by condemning heretics and burning books, sterilized and degraded a supremely great and creative people. The American Inquisition undertakes to determine what is American and what is un-American, what human freedom means and what it does not mean. Unless the American people awaken to this menace, basic freedoms which have long been our glory may be lost, and our country, bludgeoned by an insidious Neo-Fascism, can lose its leadership among the nations and its destiny among the generations.

Speaking personally, I repudiate the charge that I am "pro-Communist." I have never supported any cause which, on its own merits, was unworthy of support by an independent Christian citizen of this country who is sensitive to human situations. If, in any instance Communists, unknown to me and for their own reasons, were interested in the same cause, that does not invalidate the importance of the cause, nor does it make me responsible for any casual coincidence in my interests and theirs. My life and interests have been entirely open. I have been consistently concerned about human freedom. I am not ashamed of any document I ever signed or of any cause I ever sponsored, whether it was in the interests of Republican Spain, or in favor of Spanish refugees from Fascist tyranny, or to advocate the repeal of the McCarran Act.

I have already said it publicly and I repeat it now. We have come to a moment when in certain circles in our country you can be anything you want, if you are anti-Communist. You may be a liar, a rake, or a Fascist: everything is condoned so long as you vociferate against Communism. And yet, the way in which Communism is being fought today is the way to give it ultimate

prestige and to bring our country ultimate discredit. The real problem of Communism as a system of ideas and an attitude towards life is simply not being touched. Communism is a much more tremendous issue than is being realized.

What is meant by being "anti-Communist" or "pro-Communist"? Do we really want to combat Communism? The only constructive way, if admittedly the harder and more sacrificial way, to deal with Communism, is to tackle the ills in society and the weaknesses in human nature upon which Communism breeds. Let a concerted effort be made everywhere throughout the world to solve the problems of poverty and work, of social justice and brotherhood, and to give people a dynamic faith. Let all who believe in democracy develop a glowing, positive, fighting spirit. It is not enough to let passion flame in an anti-Communist crusade. Fanatical anti-Communism can blind rational judgment and create the kind of eerie silence that haunts graveyards. It can, with fiery vituperation, scorch values and personalities which our culture needs. The effort to uproot Communistic weeds in the garden of our society can blight flowers and destroy plants which this nation requires for its beauty and health, and ultimately for its security. Evil can never be dealt with by such a purely negative approach.

If our country is to give leadership in the rifted, revolutionary world of today, it must present a more positive and crusading view of freedom than that which now prevails. It must sponsor a freedom which has clear-cut ideals and a program of action. Men must be summoned to freedom for something of transcendent importance, something much greater than the mere absence of the pressures that push them around. For people, let it be said plainly, are not free merely when they can do what they want. They may be free in this sense and yet be slaves of lust or selfish ambition. They are truly free only when they want what is right and do what is good and are committed to what is true. More concretely, man is truly and fully free only when, with joyous abandon, he serves the Living God, the Eternal Goodness.

As president of an historic institution for the training of Christian ministers, and as the official representative for the current year of a great Protestant denomination in this country, I ask that the relevant facts come out into the open and that principles and issues be clearly defined. For responsible congressmen to give implicit sanction to the charge that the clergy are the class most infiltrated by Communism, but to add that, of course, there is no intention to investigate the clergy, represents a cynical attempt to discredit the Protestant ministry in this country.

If the smears that now attach to a host of loyal Americans in education and in the Church are allowed to remain unchallenged and unexplored, a new situation will have been created. The moment will have arrived in this country for the birth of a movement to proclaim and to apply in our time principles that are enshrined in the annals of past struggles for freedom, truth, and righteousness. As it is, the time has already come when an understanding is needed between congressional com-

mittees and the citizens and institutions of this nation as to where we all stand in relation to one another and what the rights and responsibilities of American citizens are in the world of today.

(Signed) John A. Mackay

President, Princeton Theological Seminary,
Moderator of the General Assembly of the
Presbyterian Church in the United States of
America.

July 10, 1953

Bishop Dibelius Issues Plea For Reunification of Germany

Germany (EPS)—Preaching in the Marienkirche in East Berlin on June 28, on the text, "*No man, having put his hand to the plough, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God*" (Luke 9:62), Bishop Dibelius declared that the Church should no longer talk of the "hard times" which lay behind it, but should make every possible use of the chances now being given to it once more.

Nor could it, he continued, be any part of the Church's task to say much about the events of June 17. The Church had, during those days, "felt more closely linked to the workers of honest mind than perhaps ever before in its history." And it did not forget those who had now been involved in fresh distress and sorrow. "The heart of the Church of Christ beats always for those who are in grief and suffering, no matter what the cause," he said.

The Church was above all concerned as to what was to happen next. The Bishop himself answered that question — "something decisive has got to be done to achieve the reunification of Germany." He then read out the letter he had sent on June 26, 1953, as Evangelical Bishop of Berlin and in the name of the church boards of Eastern Germany, to the four High Commissioners. *The Bishop's Letter to the High Commissioners.*

In his letter sent "by agreement with the Evangelical Church Board and with all church boards in the German Democratic Republic," to the four High Commissioners, Mr. James B. Conant, Sir Ivone Kirkpatrick, M. André Francois-Poncet and Mr. Vladimir Semenov, the Bishop appeals to them as follows:

"The Evangelical Church in Germany has again and again expressed its ardent hope for a speedy reunification of this country, not merely on political grounds—for the political side is beyond its particular sphere—but for the sake of the people for whose inner and moral life it bears responsibility. The events of the last few days have shown how serious and weighty these latter grounds are. It is not possible to rend a nation such as the Germans into two halves for years at a time, and to continue unceasingly making this fission deeper and deeper, without causing many people finally to fall prey to complete inner despair. It is gravely to be feared that outbreaks such as the one we have just experienced will repeat themselves and ultimately lead to moral chaos. Nothing can be done about it with military power. The right and lawful demands of the people will eventually have to be met.

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion
537 West 121st St., New York 27, N. Y.

EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR and JOHN C. BENNETT
Co-Chairmen

M. SEARLE BATES LISTON POPE
F. ERNEST JOHNSON HENRY P. VAN DUSEN
AMOS N. WILDER

MARION HAUSNER, *Secretary*

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JAMES C. BAKER HENRY SMITH LEIPER
HENRY SLOANE COFFIN JOHN A. MACKAY
CHARLES W. GILKEY FRANCIS P. MILLER
LYNN HAROLD HOUGH EDWARD L. PARSONS
UMPHREY LEE

"The German people has expressed its will to reunification with unsurpassable unanimity. There will be a glad willingness in every section of opinion to make some practical contribution towards the achievement of this great desire. But whether such achievement can be brought about depends on the decision of the occupying Powers."

The three High Commissioners of the Western occupying Powers answered Bishop Dibelius's appeal with identical personal letters, in which they (the Governments of France, Great Britain and the United States) agree that the recent events in Berlin and Eastern Germany have once again demonstrated the urgent necessity for enabling Germany to regain her unity under free conditions and subject to the requirements of peace all over Europe.

India's Growing National Christian Council

(EPS) Cool monsoon weather is settling down this month at Nagpur in the heart of India, and with it construction has begun on an expanded headquarters of India's National Christian Council—biggest Protestant organization in eastern Asia. Three new buildings, costing \$40,000, are being built to house the fast-growing activities of the interdenominational body whose Christian influence strongly permeates changing social conditions in India.

Detroit Public Library
Book Receiving
5201 Woodward Ave.
Detroit 2, Mich.

11 AUG 1953

650 1-54

Founded in 1913 as the National Missionary Council, the NCC of India is channeling currents of social change by carrying out such programs as providing technical training in industry and agriculture and spreading literacy throughout the nation's villages. The Nagpur construction project also serves as testimony of the NCC's increasing work among youth, its programs of Christian education, the Christian home movement, women's work, relief and reconstruction work. When the Council holds its next triennial conference, in November of this year, one of the major questions before it will be how to achieve a completely self-supporting status. Most of its operating funds still come from the United States and Great Britain. However, under the leadership of Methodist Bishop Shot K. Mondol of Hyderabad, Council president, the membership is confident that in time the Council will be able to go it alone financially.

The Colonial Crisis in Africa

(EPS) More than 160,000,000 colonial peoples of Africa are stirring in various degrees of social rebellion, and the prospects are that the ferment will intensify rather than lessen in the near future. Delivering the Lord Lugard Memorial Lecture before the Executive Council of the International Africa Institute meeting in Lisbon, Portugal, last week, Dr. Emory Ross cited four root causes leading to the African colonial crisis of today, as: 1. The phenomenal scientific and material progress of Western Europe and America. 2. Africa's slowness in keeping pace with material advancement. 3. The effect of mass communications on the African mind, whereby floods of undigestible information and knowledge have had a confusing impact on primitive societies. 4. "The split which has developed in the West between the spiritual and the secular."

Dr. Ross, retired secretary of the Foreign Mission's African Committee, emphasized that in the world's colonial relations both the Westerners and the Africans need a new balance between the spiritual and the secular. To avoid Mau Mau uprisings, the errors of 'apartheid' and other outbreaks of the colonial crisis, the noted authority on Africa said, "Westerners and Africans, separately and together, should seek to establish and maintain, with all the understanding and flexibility which a growing human society requires, a new balance between the spiritual and the secular in their lives and in their doings. "When balance and serenity rule within," he concluded, "the relations without are never so hard."

Author in This Issue

John C. Bennett is Professor of Christian Theology and Ethics at Union Theological Seminary, New York.

We remind our readers that the next issue of *Christianity and Crisis* will appear on September 21st. This office is closed for vacation during August.